

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,399	06/27/2001	Robert Alexander Keiller	1263.1745	2615

5514 7590 08/25/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
----------

VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2655

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

28

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/891,399	KEILLER, ROBERT ALEXANDER	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Huyen Vo	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. 1-21, 24-25, 27-38
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected. 22-26, 32-33
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/27/01 &amp; 5/23/02</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The applicant submitted references cited on 8/24/2001 have been considered. However, since no PTO-1449 form was submitted, they will not be listed on any subsequent patent.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 22-26 and 32-33 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 22 is drawn to a grammar store for use in a system of claim 1. Claim 22 could be infringed while not infringing upon base claim 1.

Hence, claim 22 does not further limit the base claim 1 which is drawn to a system and is therefore not properly dependent thereon. Likewise for claim 23. Claim 24 is drawn to a program product including instructions and is dependent on a system of claim 1. Infringement of the program product that merely includes instructions would not represent infringement of the system, which includes among other things, a processor. The program product does not include a processor, just instructions. Hence, claim 24 is not properly dependent on claim

1. Likewise for claims 25-26 and 32-33. *Other than the 101 issue infra, these claims are otherwise not considered on the merits.*

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Art Unit: 2655

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 24-25 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, computer program. Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process without a computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality. Therefore, the computer program product or signal, as claimed in claims 24-25 and 32-33, are drawn to nonstatutory functional descriptive material.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3-14, 16-21, and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Patent No. 6408272) in view of Hunt et al. (US Patent No. 6374226).

Art Unit: 2655

7. Regarding claim 1, White et al. disclose a system comprising: at least one device having a processor-controlled machine for causing at least one function specified by a user to be carried out and a control apparatus for enabling voice-control of the processor-controlled machine and a speech processing apparatus having means for receiving speech data representing speech by a user (*referring to figures 1-2*), a grammar store storing speech recognition grammars (*col. 7, ln. 17-56*), speech recognition means for recognizing speech in the received speech data using at least one of the speech recognition grammars (*col. 7, ln. 17-56*), speech interpreting means for interpreting the recognized speech to provide instructions for controlling at least one function of a processor-controlled machine and transmitting means for transmitting the instructions to the control apparatus (*col. 7, ln. 17-56*), the control apparatus being arranged to couple the processor-controlled machine to the speech processing apparatus (*referring to figures 1-3*), and wherein the grammar store comprises at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules (*col. 16, ln. 1-28*).

White et al. fail to specifically disclose that the control apparatus includes means for providing speech recognition grammar instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar to be used by the speech recognition means for recognizing speech data and means for transmitting speech recognition grammar instructions to the speech processing apparatus, and the first grammar being arranged to use grammar rules defined by the interface grammar and the second grammar being arranged to implement rules defined by the interface grammar,

Art Unit: 2655

and wherein the speech recognition grammar instructions providing means is arranged to provide instructions for causing the second grammar to be linked to the first grammar using the interface grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach that the control apparatus includes means for providing speech recognition grammar instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar to be used by the speech recognition means for recognizing speech data and means for transmitting speech recognition grammar instructions to the speech processing apparatus (*referring to figures 1 and 3, grammars are loaded into the recognizer for recognition of speech input*), and the first grammar being arranged to use grammar rules defined by the interface grammar and the second grammar being arranged to implement rules defined by the interface grammar, and wherein the speech recognition grammar instructions providing means is arranged to provide instructions for causing the second grammar to be linked to the first grammar using the interface grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

8. Regarding claim 11, White et al. disclose a speech processing apparatus for receiving speech data representing commands spoken by a user for controlling a function of a device, the speech processing apparatus having:

Art Unit: 2655

receiving means for receiving speech data representing speech by a user (*elements 50-52 in figure 3*); a grammar store storing speech recognition grammars (*Grammars 74 in figure 3*); speech recognition means for recognizing speech in the received speech data using at least one of the speech recognition grammars (*Speech Recognition Engine 70 in figure 3*); speech interpreting means for interpreting recognized speech to provide instructions for enabling a function of a device to be controlled (*col. 7, ln. 1-56*); and transmitting means for transmitting the instructions to a device for enabling control of a function of that device (*elements 50-52 in figure 3*).

White et al. fail to specifically disclose that the grammar store comprises at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules, the first grammar being arranged to use grammar rules defined by the interface grammar and the second grammar being arranged to implement rules defined by the interface grammar such that the second grammar can be linked to the first grammar using the interface grammar to form an extended grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach that the grammar store comprises at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules, the first grammar being arranged to use grammar rules defined by the interface grammar and the second grammar being arranged to implement rules defined by the interface grammar such that the second grammar can be linked to the first grammar using the interface grammar to form an extended grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).



Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

9. Regarding claim 13, White et al. disclose a control apparatus for coupling a processor-controlled machine to speech processing apparatus for enabling a user to control a function of a machine by spoken commands (*figures 1-3*), but fail to specifically disclose that the control apparatus having: means for providing speech recognition grammar instructions defining a speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used by the speech processing apparatus means for recognizing speech data; and means for transmitting to the speech processing apparatus the speech recognition grammar instructions for speech data representing words spoken by a user, the speech recognition grammar instructions providing means being arranged to provide instructions for causing first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach that the control apparatus having: means for providing speech recognition grammar instructions defining a speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used by the speech processing apparatus means for recognizing speech data; and means for transmitting to the speech processing apparatus the speech recognition grammar instructions for speech data

Art Unit: 2655

representing words spoken by a user, the speech recognition grammar instructions providing means being arranged to provide instructions for causing first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

10. Regarding claim 14, White et al. disclose a control apparatus for enabling coupling of a processor-controlled machine to speech processing apparatus for enabling a user to control a function of the processor-controlled machine by spoken commands, the control apparatus comprising: receiving means for receiving from the speech processing apparatus instructions derived from speech recognized by the speech processing apparatus (*Transceiver 32 in figure 1*); dialog communication means for communicating with the user to provide information to the user in response to instructions received from the speech processing apparatus thereby enabling a dialog with the user (*col. 7, ln. 1 to col. 8, ln. 38*), wherein the dialog communication means has a number of different dialog states and is arranged to change dialog state in response to received

instructions (*col. 7, ln. 1 to col. 8, ln. 38, the operation of the local device is based on instructions received from the remote server*).

White et al. fail to disclose that the control apparatus being arranged to supply to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state of the dialog communication means such that, in at least one dialog state, the control apparatus is arranged to provide instructions to cause first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach that the control apparatus being arranged to supply to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state of the dialog communication means such that, in at least one dialog state, the control apparatus is arranged to provide instructions to cause first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

Art Unit: 2655

11. Regarding claim 27, White et al. disclose that in a system comprising: at least one device having a processor-controlled machine for causing at least one function specified by a user to be carried out and a control apparatus for enabling voice-control of the processor-controlled machine and a speech processing apparatus having means for receiving speech data representing speech by a user (*referring to figures 1-2*), a grammar store storing speech recognition grammars (*col. 7, ln. 17-56*), speech recognition means for recognizing speech in the received speech data using at least one of the speech recognition grammars (*col. 7, ln. 17-56*), speech interpreting means for interpreting the recognized speech to provide instructions for controlling at least one function of a processor-controlled machine and transmitting means for transmitting the instructions to the control apparatus (*col. 7, ln. 17-56*).

White et al. fail to specifically disclose a method of operating the control apparatus which comprises: providing speech recognition grammar instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar to be used by the speech recognition means for recognizing speech data to the speech processing apparatus to cause a first grammar using grammar rules defined by an interface grammar to be linked by the interface grammar to a second grammar which implements rules defined by the interface grammar to form an extended grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach a method of operating the control apparatus which comprises: providing speech recognition grammar instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar to be used by the speech recognition means for recognizing speech data to the speech processing apparatus to cause a first

Art Unit: 2655

grammar using grammar rules defined by an interface grammar to be linked by the interface grammar to a second grammar which implements rules defined by the interface grammar to form an extended grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

12. Regarding claim 29, White et al. disclose a method of operating a speech processing apparatus for receiving speech data representing commands spoken by a user for controlling a function of a device, the method comprising: receiving speech data representing speech by a user (*Elements 50-52 in figure 3*); recognizing speech in the received speech data (*col. 7, ln. 1-56*); interpreting recognized speech to provide instructions for enabling a function of a device to be controlled (*col. 7, ln. 1-56*); and transmitting the instructions to a device for enabling control of a function of that device to form an extended grammar (*col. 7, ln. 1-56*).

White et al. do not disclose the steps of accessing a grammar store comprising at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules; and causing a first grammar which uses grammar rules defined by an interface grammar to be linked by the

Art Unit: 2655

interface grammar to a second grammar which implements rules defined by the interface grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach the steps of accessing a grammar store comprising at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*); and causing a first grammar which uses grammar rules defined by an interface grammar to be linked by the interface grammar to a second grammar which implements rules defined by the interface grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

13. Regarding claim 30, White et al. disclose a method of operating a control apparatus for coupling a processor-controlled machine to speech processing apparatus for enabling a user to control a function of a machine by spoken commands (*referring to figures 1-3 and col. 7, ln. 1-56*).

White et al. do not disclose a method comprises transmitting speech recognition grammar instructions defining a speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used by the speech processing apparatus means for recognizing speech data including instructions for causing first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first

Art Unit: 2655

grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach a method comprises transmitting speech recognition grammar instructions defining a speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used by the speech processing apparatus means for recognizing speech data including instructions for causing first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

14. Regarding claim 31, White et al. disclose a method of operating a control apparatus for enabling coupling of a processor-controlled machine to speech processing apparatus remote from the processor-controlled machine for enabling a user to control a function of the processor-controlled machine by spoken commands, the method comprising: receiving from the speech processing apparatus instructions derived from speech recognized by the speech processing apparatus (*element 32 in figure 2*); communicating with the user to provide information to the user in response to instructions received from the speech

Art Unit: 2655

processing apparatus using a dialog which has a number of different dialog states dependent upon the received instructions (*col. 7, ln. 1 to col. 8, ln. 25*).

White et al. do not disclose the step of supplying to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state of the dialog communication means such that, in at least one dialog state, the instructions cause first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach the step of supplying to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state of the dialog communication means such that, in at least one dialog state, the instructions cause first and second grammars to be linked by an interface grammar having grammar rules usable by the first grammar and implementable by the second grammar so as to form an extended grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

15. Regarding claims 3-4 and 17-18, White et al. further disclose a system according to claims 1 and 16 above, respectively, wherein the processor-



Art Unit: 2655

controlled machine of said at least one device is arranged to carried out said at least one function (*col. 7, ln. 10-56*), wherein the processor-controlled machine is a microwave oven (*col. 7, ln. 17-40*).

16. Regarding claims 10 and 16, White et al. further disclose that the control apparatus is arranged to couple the processor-controlled machine to the speech processing apparatus via a network (*col. 9, ln. 11 to col. 10, ln. 35*), and device comprising a control apparatus in accordance with the claim 13 and a processor-controlled machine (*figure 2*).

17. Regarding claims 5-6 and 19-20, White et al. further disclose a system according to claims 1 and 16 above, respectively, wherein the processor-controlled machine of said at least one device is arranged to cause another device coupled to the network to carry out the at least one function (*col. 7, ln. 10-56*), and the other device is a device comprising a processor-controlled machine and a control apparatus (*referring to figures 1-3*).

18. Regarding claims 7-8, 12, and 21, White et al. further disclose that different type of devices can be used as the local device (*col. 5, ln. 39-54*) and different grammars can be used for specific application of the local device (*col. 7, ln. 1-67*). White et al. fail to specifically disclose that at least one device comprises a digital camera and said other device comprises a printer, and the first grammar comprises a camera grammar and the second grammar comprises

Art Unit: 2655

a printer grammar. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White by incorporating a camera as the local device and printer as the server, each having its own grammar. The advantage of this is to use voice command to print pictures, at a remote location, taken by the camera

19. Regarding claim 9, White et al. disclose a system according to claim 1, wherein the control apparatus comprises receiving means for receiving instructions derived from speech recognized by the speech recognition means (*Transceiver 32 in figure 2*); dialog communication means for communicating with the user to provide information to the user in response to instructions received by said receiving means thereby enabling a dialog with the user (*Elements 20-26 in figure 2*), wherein the dialog communication means has a number of different dialog states and is arranged to change dialog states in response to instructions receiving by the receiving means (*col. 7, ln. 1-55, the operation of the local device will change according the instructions received from the server*).

White et al. fail to specifically disclose that the control apparatus is arranged to supply to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state of the dialog communication means such that, in at least one dialog state, the control apparatus is arranged to provide instructions to cause said first and second grammars to be linked by said interface grammar.

However, Hunt et al. teach that the control apparatus is arranged to supply to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state of the dialog communication means such that, in at least one dialog state, the control apparatus is arranged to provide instructions to cause said first and second grammars to be linked by said interface grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

20. Regarding claim 28, White et al. disclose a method according to claim 27, which comprises: receiving instructions derived from speech recognized by the speech recognition means (*col. 7, ln. 1 to col. 8, ln. 25*); and communicating with the user to provide information to the user in response to received instructions enabling a dialog with the user with the dialog having a dialog state dependent on the received instructions (*col. 7, ln. 1 to col. 8, ln. 25*).

White et al. fail to disclose the step of supplying to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state such that, in at least one dialog state, the instructions cause said first and second grammars to be linked by said interface grammar. However, Hunt et al. further teach that the step of supplying

Art Unit: 2655

to the speech processing apparatus instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar or grammars to be used in dependence upon the dialog state such that, in at least one dialog state, the instructions cause said first and second grammars to be linked by said interface grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

21. Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Patent No. 6408272) in view of Hunt et al. (US Patent No. 6374226), as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Baker et al. (US Patent No. 6456974).

22. Regarding claims 2 and 15, the modified White et al. do not disclose a control apparatus according to claims 1 and 13 above, respectively, wherein the control apparatus comprises a JAVA virtual machine. However, Baker et al. teach that the control apparatus comprises a JAVA virtual machine (*figures 1-3*).

Since the modified White et al. and Baker et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify White et al. by

Art Unit: 2655

incorporating the teaching of Baker et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

23. Claims 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Patent No. 6408272) in view of Dragosh et al. (US Patent No. 6078886).

24. Regarding claim 34, White et al. disclose a control apparatus for enabling a user to control a function of each of a plurality of processed-controlled machines by spoken commands interpreted by speech processing apparatus using speech recognition grammars (*col. 7, ln. 1-67*). White et al. fail to specifically disclose that the control apparatus having a connection manager for determining from a command spoken by a user the machine that the user wishes to control and speech recognition grammar accessing means for accessing a grammar or grammars for the machine identified by the connecting manager to enable subsequent commands to be interpreted by the speech processing apparatus using the access grammar or grammars.

However, Dragosh et al. teach that the control apparatus having a connection manager for determining from a command spoken by a user the machine that the user wishes to control and speech recognition grammar accessing means for accessing a grammar or grammars for the machine identified by the connecting manager to enable subsequent commands to be

Art Unit: 2655

interpreted by the speech processing apparatus using the access grammar or grammars (*col. 4, ln. 27 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Dragosh et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Dragosh et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy by using specific grammars for specific applications.

25. Regarding claim 35, White et al. do not specifically disclose an apparatus according to claim 34, wherein the control apparatus is arranged to access the speech recognition grammar or grammars by downloading from the identified machine. However, Dragosh et al. further teach that the control apparatus is arranged to access the speech recognition grammar or grammars by downloading from the identified machine (*col. 4, ln. 27 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Dragosh et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Dragosh et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

26. Regarding claim 36, White et al. further disclose a control apparatus according to claim 34, incorporating speech processing apparatus for processing commands received by the control apparatus (*referring to figure 3*).

27. Regarding claim 37, White et al. do not disclose a control apparatus according to claim 34, wherein the connection manager is arranged to determine from commands spoken by a user when the user wishes to control another machine and to access the speech recognition grammar or grammars for that machine to enable subsequent commands to interpreted using the accessed grammar or grammars.

However, Dragosh et al. further teach that the connection manager is arranged to determine from commands spoken by a user when the user wishes to control another machine and to access the speech recognition grammar or grammars for that machine to enable subsequent commands to interpreted using the accessed grammar or grammars (*col. 4, ln. 27 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since White et al. and Dragosh et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Dragosh et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

28. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Patent No. 6408272) in view of Dragosh et al. (US Patent No. 6078886), and further in view of Hunt et al. (US Patent No. 6374226).

Art Unit: 2655

29. Regarding claim 38, White et al. disclose a system comprising: a processor-controlled machine for causing at least one function specified by a user to be carried out (*figure 2*); a control apparatus for enabling voice-control of the processor-controlled machine (*figure 2*); an audio input device for receiving speech from a user and for supplying speech data representing the received speech (*element 20 in figure 2*); and a speech processing apparatus having means for receiving speech data from the audio input device (*figure 3*), a grammar store storing speech recognition grammars, speech recognition means for recognizing speech in the received speech data using at least one of the speech recognition grammars, speech interpreting means for interpreting the recognized speech to provide instructions for controlling at least one function of a processor-controlled machine and transmitting means for transmitting the instructions to the control apparatus (*figures 1-3 and col. 7, ln. 1-67*).

White et al. do not disclose that the control apparatus being arranged to couple the processor-controlled machine to the speech processing apparatus and having means for providing speech recognition grammar instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar to be used by the speech recognition means for recognizing speech data and means for transmitting speech recognition grammar instructions to the speech processing apparatus, wherein the grammar store comprises at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules, the first grammar being arranged to use grammar rules defined by the interface grammar and the second grammar being arranged to implement rules defined by



Art Unit: 2655

the interface grammar, and wherein the speech recognition grammar instructions providing means is arranged to provide instructions for causing the second grammar to be linked to the first grammar using the interface grammar.

However, Dragosh et al. teach that the control apparatus being arranged to couple the processor-controlled machine to the speech processing apparatus and having means for providing speech recognition grammar instructions regarding the speech recognition grammar to be used by the speech recognition means for recognizing speech data and means for transmitting speech recognition grammar instructions to the speech processing apparatus (*col. 4, ln. 27-56*).

Since White et al. and Dragosh et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Dragosh et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy by providing specific grammars for specific application.

The modified White et al. still fail to disclose that the grammar store comprises at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules, the first grammar being arranged to use grammar rules defined by the interface grammar and the second grammar being arranged to implement rules defined by the interface grammar, and wherein the speech recognition grammar instructions providing means is arranged to provide instructions for causing the second grammar to be linked to the first grammar using the interface grammar.

However, Hunt et al. further teach that the grammar store comprises at least first and second grammars having grammar rules and at least one interface grammar defining grammar rules, the first grammar being arranged to use grammar rules defined by the interface grammar and the second grammar being arranged to implement rules defined by the interface grammar, and wherein the speech recognition grammar instructions providing means is arranged to provide instructions for causing the second grammar to be linked to the first grammar using the interface grammar (*referring to figure 3 and col. 5, ln. 1 to col. 6, ln. 67*).

Since the modified White et al. and Hunt et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify White et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hunt et al. in order to enhance speech recognition accuracy.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen Vo whose telephone number is 703-305-8665. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 703-305-4827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner Huyen X. Vo

August 10, 2004

\*\*\*



W. R. YOUNG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER